

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. V, No. 13

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

July 1, 1975

Dixy Lee Ray Bows Out of State Dept. Post

Dixy Lee Ray's abrupt resignation June 20 as chief of science-related affairs for the State Department has chiefly attracted notice because, in defiance of the mores of the federal bureaucracy, she did not exit with praise for the very people who precipitated her departure. However, the resignation also merits notice as a timely antidote to the mindless cheer that has been evoked by President Ford's announcement that he plans to re-establish the post of White House science adviser (SGR Vol. V, No. 12).

The President, in making his announcement, deemed it a plus for the stability and influence of the proposed office that he is asking Congress to establish it on a statutory basis, the presumption being that if the presidential adviser exists by Act of Congress, his or her stature will somehow be enhanced; furthermore, it has been argued in behalf of the statutory basis, this approach will prevent the adviser and the office from being ousted by presidential "whim," which is generally said to have been the inspiration for Nixon's demolition of the Office of Science and Technology in 1973.

Well, let it be noted that the State Department Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (OES), which Ray headed with the elevated rank of Assistant Secretary, was—like the proposed White House science office—created under Congressional pressure and through Act of Congress.

Nevertheless, under the well-established rule governing horses and drinking water, there is no way at all to compel the leader of an organization to pay heed to a subordinate whom

he chooses to ignore, which accounts for Ray stating in her letter of resignation to Kissinger:

"For some time I had hoped that my office and the Bureau I head would play a significant role in the formulation of the Department's science policy and in the provision of information upon which to base policy in those areas of technology specifically assigned to the OES Bureau by Congress.

"Unfortunately, that desirable condition has not been fulfilled. Many of the areas for which OES has statutory responsibility are, in fact, being pursued in other bureaus and offices.

"I sincerely hope that the Department seriously re-examines its administrative procedures with a view toward permitting its bureaus to function efficiently."

It can be argued that the creation of OES took place with no more than grudging acceptance on Kissinger's part, whereas President Ford appears to have been persuaded that he needs fulltime science advice and has taken the initiative in acquiring it.

But the truth of the matter is that if Ford is thirsting for science advice, there is no need to embark on the laborious charade involved in obtaining Congressional approval. He could simply appoint a science adviser, authorize the acquisition of staff, and that would be that. The setup could be made a bit sturdier, if so desired, by employing an Executive Order or setting forth a Reorganization Plan which would go

(continued on page 2)

Though Honored Guests, No Tickets No Lunch for OTA, AAAS Heads

Emilio Daddario, director of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, and William Carey, executive officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, had an unplanned private lunch June 13.

Invited to sit at the head table at a National Press Club luncheon that Ralph Nader was giving on the occasion of the publication of Philip Boffey's book, *The Brain Bank of America* (SGR Vol. V, No. 12), the two were asked for tickets by a Press Club doorkeeper. When they replied that they were guests of Nader, they were curtly informed that Nader had no authority to issue invitations to the Press Club. So, they went off and had lunch together elsewhere.

Another ticketless headtable invitee, Mike Jacobson, of the Center for Science in the Public Interest, was also denied admission; going lunchless, he took in the proceedings from a balcony position.

Nader associates say no Kremlinological analysis should be devoted to the episode; they explain that they merely forgot to provide the Press Club with a list of invitees.

In Brief

In a rare exercise, the General Accounting Office has measured performance against the big-spending, program-shifting promises contained in Nixon's March 1972 Special Message on Science and Technology. "With few exceptions," Elmer B. Staats, head of GAO, told the House Science and Technology Committee on June 17, "we were unable to identify substantive changes resulting from it."

The timetable for Congressional action on the President's bill to re-establish a White House science office reflects no hurry. The House Science and Technology Committee plans a period of reflection and study following completion of hearings. On the Senate side, no date has been set for hearings.

The State Department science office just vacated by Dixy Lee Ray was originally offered to and accepted by William A. Nierenberg, director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SGR Vol. IV, No. 19). But following a long delay in orders to report for work, Nierenberg took a closer look at the job and prophetically concluded that Secretary Kissinger did not regard the post seriously. He then turned it down, despite pleas that Kissinger and others longed for his services.

House Blocks Effort to Tie Bauman Scheme to NSF Bill

A House-Senate conference committee has at last been established, after more than a month's delay, to work out a final version of the NSF authorization bill and to settle the fate of the so-called Bauman amendment, which is designed to give Congress power to veto individual NSF grants before they are awarded (SGR Vol. V, No. 9). It is now a safe bet that the amendment will at least be watered down.

Normally a routine matter, appointment of the conference committee had been held up while NSF's critics in the House tried unsuccessfully to make sure that the Bauman amendment was written into the final version of the bill. Rep. Robert Bauman (R-Md.), who sponsored the infamous measure when the NSF bill was passed by the House on April 9, last week proposed a resolution instructing the House conferees not to accept a compromise on the amendment. The resolution was voted down, 127-284.

Although it was soundly defeated, the resolution nevertheless picked up a surprising amount of support, and many of those who voted against it did so because a move to limit the negotiating power of conferees is generally viewed with disfavor. In other words, the vote probably doesn't reflect the depth of hostility towards NSF in the House - hostility which has its roots in a number of widely publicized attacks on NSF grants with trivial or humorous titles - and for that reason the conferees are likely to make at least a token gesture to the critics. A vague instruction to NSF to keep Congress more fully informed of its activities is considered likely.

Bauman, for his part, was clearly miffed by the way the NSF authorization bill was cleverly whipped through the Senate by Senator Kennedy before Bauman had much of a chance to orchestrate any support for his measure in that body. The NSF bill was passed by the Senate Labor and

Public Welfare Committee on May 12 and was brought to the floor the following day and passed without debate.

The Senate version of the bill contains a provision instructing the Director of NSF to allow more public participation in the setting of NSF policies.

Meanwhile, the House Appropriations Committee last week passed an appropriations bill for NSF (see p.3) and the Committee's report cautions "against acting in haste to change the current (NSF granting) procedures in such a way that might seriously undermine our basic research capability."

Noting that many of the specific projects which have come under attack have either been supported by agencies other than NSF, or have involved research which has potentially useful applications, the committee also urged NSF "to give immediate attention to procedures assuring that descriptive information, including titles of projects, is presented in a manner that will avoid misinterpretation and that will convey to the layman some understanding of the potential significance of the scientific research being supported."

Those concerns will all get an airing when the House Committee on Science and Technology begins a series of hearings on NSF's granting procedures later this month.

Ray Clashed with A-Power Skeptics

Apart from generally being ignored by the State Department's top inner circle, it appears that Dixy Lee Ray dissented seriously from some pet themes of Secretary Kissinger, and was particularly in conflict with a Kissinger protege, Fred Ikle, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA).

Ikle, a Rand Corporation alumnus, has recently been warning in a series of speeches that the US has sown the potential for disaster by encouraging the worldwide spread of nuclear technology (SGR Vol. V, No. 5).

As former head of the Atomic Energy Commission and an advocate of the rapid development of nuclear power, Ray did not share that sentiment, nor was she pleased when the State Department vetoed the sale of American nuclear technology to Brazil because of its dissatisfaction with the safeguards arrangements. Brazil subsequently closed a deal with West Germany.

According to an interview that she gave to the *New York Times*, she feels that ACDA and State Department officials are "too hysterical" about the alleged problems of controlling nuclear power.

RESIGNATION (continued from page 1)

into effect unless voted down by Congress. The essential point, however, is that the President is almost wholly sovereign in matters concerning his own staff arrangements.

Hindsight now establishes that the high hopes that accompanied Ray's appointment to the State Department (SGR Vol. IV, No. 19) were really pretty foolish. The Bureau that she headed, and its various predecessors, dating back to 1951, stemmed more from some senior scientists' desire for recognition of their international nature of their trade than from the State Department's desire to employ scientific wisdom in the formulation of foreign policy. Over the years, the science office had its ups and downs, but the ups were never very high in terms of influence in Foggy Bottom. The difference between Ray and her various predecessors in the job was that they easily settled for the ceremonials and busywork that go along with the post, whereas she decided after only five months that being chief of scientific matters for the US Department of State is not worth the time of a serious adult.

A marine biologist who formerly taught at the University of Washington, she says she may return there; she also says she is seriously thinking of seeking the Democratic nomination for Governor. —DSG

Biomedical Panel: Does Talent Flock to Money?

Continuing with selected readings from the transcripts of the monthly meetings of the President's Biomedical Research Panel (SGR Vol. V, No. 11), we encounter Chairman Franklin D. Murphy prodding his colleagues on the question of why more scientists don't concern themselves with such serious problems as alcoholism, drug abuse, and population planning.

Reciting from a well-worn hymn book, some of them reply that science is not well equipped to deal with these problems, which is evidenced, they contend, by failures of past efforts to pay off.

Murphy, the Times-Mirror physician-executive who is leading the inquiry that is supposed to tell the President and Congress what ails the biomedical programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, replies:

"Let me be a little obscene, at least in intellectual terms, and react to my experiences in having managed two large universities." And he goes on to relate that "when substantial funds were made available for African studies, there were a number of political scientists and sociologists . . . that got very interested in African studies—at a very fundamental level, you understand.

"In short," he continued, "there is some evidence . . . that availability of funding provides some kind of direction—and I'm not talking about demeaning the product; I am not talking about an inadequate product—I am talking about directing interest and attention even at a very fundamental level."

The meeting, which was for the purpose of organizing various aspects of the 15-month study, was treated by some of the panel members and witnesses to standardized lament-

ations about public and Congressional hostility to science and medicine, from which hostility, it was contended, the two professions are innocent sufferers.

Contesting this theme was Benno Schmidt, the banker-lawyer-Nixon crony who serves on the panel *ex officio* through his chairmanship of the President's Cancer Panel. Schmidt, who spends a lot of time making the rounds in Washington, in contrast to his colleagues, who generally philosophize from afar, observed:

"My own impression is that biomedical research still has an extremely high standing, both in the Congress and with the public . . . I think biomedical research has had some very unhappy blows from an administration that has not been generally favorable toward biomedical research as a whole. It has supported the cancer program well and certain other programs well, but it has not generally been supportive of biomedical research in a strong way.

"But I think you have to look at the extent to which Congress has tried to repair that damage. And Congress is very much closer to the public pulse on this than the Administration is.

"So I think biomedical research has an extremely strong residue of public and Congressional support (and) I don't think there should be any feeling that we are up against a terrible trend here, so far as biomedical research is concerned."

Taking a modest view of his profession, Professor Eugene Braunwald, of Harvard Medical School, opined that "if this

(continued on page 4)

House Cuts \$44 Million from NSF, Mostly in Basic Research

On top of NSF's political troubles with Congress comes a recommendation from the House Appropriations Committee that \$44.3 million should be slashed from the FY 1976 budget request for NSF, the bulk of the reduction coming from support of basic research. In addition, the Committee has told NSF not to spend any money next year in promoting and marketing school science courses.

The ban on course implementation follows a spate of right-wing criticism of an NSF-sponsored course called MACOS (Man: A Course for Study), which has come under fire because it depicts the rough realities of eskimo life in a fairly explicit manner. The Appropriations Committee has recommended that NSF should halt all its course implementation activities - such as sponsoring courses for teachers to acquaint them with instructional materials - for a year while NSF and Congress study the matter.

The Committee accepts the "need to acquaint teachers with new course materials," but it suggests that government promotion of government-developed courses "could lead to the establishment of a single federal standard for education in the various fields of science." The Committee suggests that the \$9.2 million requested for course im-

plementation should be spent on other NSF education activities, such as the development of new courses.

There's more than a touch of irony in the recommendation, since NSF has repeatedly been told by the House Science and Technology Committee in previous years that it should do more to acquaint schools with courses developed with NSF funds.

Meanwhile, the Science and Technology Committee has established a panel to review NSF's course implementation activities, and an internal NSF study has recommended that the Foundation should continue to sponsor activities to acquaint teachers with new courses developed by government and private concerns.

As for the proposed reduction in the NSF budget, the Appropriations Committee has recommended that NSF should be given a budget of \$345 million for project support (essentially grants to individual scientists), which is just \$5 million more than last year, and \$35 million less than the Administration requested. "In the overall perspective of federal programs," the Committee said, "this is a proper level of funding to maintain at this time a national and special research program."

New Aging and Juvenile Agencies Off to Slow Starts

Congress last year authorized the creation of a National Institute on Aging and an Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, both to conduct research and programs in their respective fields. The newcomers, however, are heavily bogged down by unfilled appointments and penny-pinching budgets, and the situation is nicely symbolized by the presence of a pediatrician as acting director of the National Institute on Aging.

The NIA, the most recent addition to the ten National Institutes of Health, is getting off to a creaky start. A year after Congress passed the Research on Aging Act, a permanent director for the Institute has yet to be nominated, the staff of the Adult Development and Aging Branch of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) is only now being transferred to the new unit, and the Department of Health Education and Welfare shows no signs of lifting its current lid on positions to give the fledgling agency the management personnel it needs.

Social Science Report

Norman Kretchmer, the pediatrician director of NICHD who has been acting director of NIA, is generally known to be itching to turn his full-time interests to his own agency and to turn over his added responsibilities, which he never wanted in the first place, to someone devoted to aging. A management staff of half a dozen, including secretaries, now constitutes the whole of NIA and is responsible for engineering the transfer of NICHD aging personnel to NIA and coordinating plans with other components of HEW—Social Security, the Administration on Aging, the National Institute of Mental Health and a host of others that have some interest or programmatic responsibility in the aging field. It took until April to get a National Advisory Council on Aging together for its first meeting, and, without an Institute director, the Council

is operating in the dark.

Meanwhile, under legislation, the Institute is required to take the lead in preparing within a year a comprehensive research plan on aging for the Department as a whole. The April meeting of the Council produced a plan for a plan which one member characterized as "a basic Harvard outline" on aging. Its research categories included biomedical, behavioral, operational and evaluative research and called for research from the molecular to the political level. In addition to showing HEW the most promising directions for research, the Institute must plot its own research directions. Although the NIA is being built upon the existing extramural and intramural research programs of the Adult Development Aging Branch in NICHD, its mandate is broader and it's likely that behavioral and social research will receive more emphasis in the future.

But, venturing beyond NICHD aging research activities may take a while, given the meager \$16 million FY 76 budget. There is currently a \$9-million backlog of approved grants unfunded in the NICHD aging unit and the FY 1976 budget would allow for funding 74 per cent of the non-competing grants, instead of the usual 100 per cent. Only 17 per cent of competing research grants could be funded. In addition, the administrative personnel needed to carry out grants management and other business is short by about 18 slots for the Office of Director and about 10 positions for the intramural program, according to Kretchmer's estimates.

What's needed most right now, however, is a director. According to gerontologist-psychiatrist Carl Eisdorfer from the University of Washington, the first of a series of specialists to refuse the job, it's hard to tell what the organization is going to look like. Although a lot of the stars in gerontology were recruited for the advisory council, few top-flight researchers or researcher-clinicians want to give up their academic posts and/or private practices to take a \$36,000 job administering \$16 million in research. The most recent candidate to turn down the post is Stanford microbiologist Leonard Hayflick, and there's no nomination in sight.

The situation is worse in trying to get the new Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention off the ground at the Justice Department. Despite recent passionate rhetoric from the White House on stemming crime, the Administration has continuously fought funding to implement last year's Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. The Justice Department's own statistics point to a 144 per cent increase in the arrest of persons under 18 years of age for serious crimes between 1960 and 1973—the comparable rate for older offenders is 17 per cent—and they show that about 23 per cent of those arrested for violent crimes are youths.

Justice Department reports and surveys also show that juvenile facilities are in deplorable condition, that many juveniles are held in adult facilities and that many youths enter the criminal justice system by way of offenses for which they would not be punished if were they adults. A recent

BIOMEDICAL (continued from page 3)

country is here a hundred years from now, and the history of this era is written, of the 25 years between 1950 and 1975, that the heroes that will emerge from that will be the people who lead American science during this time.

"No," he conceded, "I think there have been some faults. I think one can find isolated examples. But I think that the forward thrust of science is something that this country ought to be proud of. I think if there is a fault it has to do with the fact that we were not smart enough to try to educate the public . . . I think the scientific process is not understood and for this reason, we are no longer in favor."

Replied Chairman Murphy: "Before I turn it over to my colleagues, may I say I don't have much confidence in that. . . We are having difficulty enough, apparently, teaching the secondary school people how to use the English language, and if we can't do that, how to teach the nuances of science, I don't know."

(continued on page 5)

Vote on Breeder Reveals the Opposition Is Growing

With scant attention paid by the general press, the House last week took an important vote on the nuclear power program when it debated the authorization bill for the Energy Research and Development Administration. An amendment designed to delay construction of the Clinch River fast breeder demonstration plant for about 18 months, to allow time for completion of a variety of studies, was defeated, 136-227.

It was the first real test of the strength of anti-nuclear sympathies in Congress, and although the amendment was soundly defeated, the fact that it picked up the support of nearly a third of the House members is indication of growing unease on Capitol Hill about the nuclear power program. A similar amendment will be proposed when the ERDA bill is debated in the Senate early in July.

Proposed by Lawrence Coughlin (R-Pa.), the amendment would simply have prohibited construction at the Clinch River

site and prevented equipment from being procured for the reactor during fiscal year 1976. Coughlin pointed out that ERDA has yet to complete its final environmental impact statement on the breeder program, the National Academy of Sciences will be conducting a study of the entire nuclear program, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is in the midst of an investigation of the breeder, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is conducting a review of the hazards associated with the use of plutonium as a reactor fuel. He therefore offered the not unreasonable suggestion that it would be sensible to wait until some of those studies are completed.

Coughlin's amendment was supported by Morris Udall (D-Ariz.) and eight other members of the House Interior subcommittee on energy and the environment, which recently completed four days of hearings on the breeder program. Udall said in a statement that although the liquid metal fast breeder reactor "is an important energy option which might be adopted late in this century and early in the next," the Clinch River reactor "has been plagued by massive cost increases and design problems." He suggested that "to go ahead with a project immersed in problems is not good government practice."

Though the Coughlin amendment was defeated, the House approved an amendment offered by Mike McCormack (D-Wash.), a key supporter of the nuclear program, to shave some \$71 million off the budget for the breeder reactor program. The reduction, which had been recommended by ERDA Administrator Robert Seamans Jr., takes account of delays in the schedule for the Clinch River reactor.

The House also approved an amendment to add \$64 million to the budget request for solar energy, to bring the total to nearly \$200 million. The move was, however, opposed by McCormack - a longtime supporter of solar R&D - on the basis that the money cannot wisely be spent.

JUVENILE (continued from page 4)

report from the General Accounting Office sharply criticized current efforts on the delinquency front and supported steps included in the legislation. Nevertheless, when President Ford signed the measure last September, he said he wouldn't seek funding for it until the economy had improved. Even when the Office of Management and Budget recommended reprogramming some Justice Department monies to get things started in FY 1975, the White House balked. In addition, the Administration requested no funding for FY 1976.

In a second supplemental appropriations bill enacted recently, Congress gave the Justice Department \$25 million for delinquency programs, but the figure falls far short of the \$75 million first-year authorization called for in the Act. And, money is only part of the picture.

Organization of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has been held up because of the Administration's reluctance to implement the legislation; although an advisory council has been appointed, no administrator has been named to head the unit. Nomination of an administrator has been caught up in the philosophical struggle between cops and social workers, and although it looks like the social workers may win out - New York's youth services chief Milton Luger is a leading contender for the job - fashioning an operating unit has suffered for lack of leadership.

The new law places heavy emphasis on deinstitutionalization of correctional centers for juveniles to encourage the movement away from training schools to group homes and small community-based facilities. It provides grants to states for treatment and funds for training, research and program evaluation. It sets up a National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention under the Office to handle those functions and to serve as a clearinghouse to disseminate research findings and information on treatment and control of juvenile offenders. Needless to say, the Institute hasn't been established yet and no director has been named.

-PM

Renamed Lab Renamed

The Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which Congress last year renamed the Holifield National Laboratory in honor of former Rep. Chet Holifield, is likely to be rechristened yet again. Last week, the House of Representatives agreed that the title of the establishment should be changed back to the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and that the Heavy Ion Research Facility under construction there should bear Holifield's name. Rep. Marilyn Lloyd (D-Tenn.), whose district includes the laboratory, last week successfully proposed an amendment to that effect in the ERDA authorization bill. She said that she had received nearly 1000 telegrams, telephone calls, letters and personal representations asking that the name be changed back to Oak Ridge. Lloyd had previously proposed that the controversial Clinch River Breeder Reactor should be renamed in honor of Holifield, but the suggestion was quietly dropped when the breeder program began to run into political trouble.

Funds Knocked Out in House for Venus Spacecraft

The House Appropriations Committee last week surprised NASA officials by deleting most of the funds proposed for the so-called Pioneer Venus program, and by suggesting that a choice may have to be made between the Venus mission and the Large Space Telescope (LST). Both programs have been accorded top priority by the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences, and NASA officials said last week that they had received no indication that Congress would force a choice.

The Committee report states that "some astronomers have been critical of NASA's Space Science program because they contend that a disproportionate level of NASA dollars have been used on planetary astronomy missions, while little or no funds have been allocated to deep space astronomy, which is the principal mission of the Large Space Telescope." The report went on to suggest

that "it is not the intention of the Committee to eliminate Pioneer Venus. Rather, the Committee is deferring this program for one year in order to strike a budget priority between Pioneer Venus and the LST."

The Pioneer Venus program would entail launching two spacecraft to Venus in 1978, one of which would orbit the planet while the other would send probes into its atmosphere. LST, on the other hand, is a powerful optical telescope which would be placed in Earth orbit by the shuttle in the early 1980s.

The Appropriations Committee left untouched every other item in NASA's budget, including the shuttle, and its action simply bears out warnings from space scientists that the shuttle will take up a gradually increasing share of NASA's budget, thereby squeezing out many important science programs.

Study Finds Disaster Research Is a Calamity

A severe indictment of the scope and direction of government-supported research into the causes and effects of natural disasters was handed down last month by two researchers at the University of Colorado. They concluded that "the preponderant Federal investment in natural hazards research is in studies which enforce rather than reduce the likelihood of catastrophe."

That conclusion is based on a massive study, *Assessment of Research on Natural Hazards* (MIT Press), conducted over the past several years with a grant from the National Science Foundation by Gilbert F. White and J. Eugene Haas.

The chief finding is that, although the federal government is supporting some worthy research on such topics as earthquake prediction, tornado warnings, hurricane mitigation, and hail suppression, economic and social studies have been largely ignored. As a consequence, planning for natural disasters in vulnerable communities is inadequate.

The study points out that there is also poor coordination among government agencies, "only a small proportion of all hazard-related research findings ever reach the general public," there have been virtually no systematic studies of how communities plan for, and recover from, natural disasters, and there is little evidence that research findings are incorporated into disaster planning.

White and Haas offer a slew of recommendations to counter some of the deficiencies they turned up. They suggest, in short, that the present research program should be augmented with studies into the social and economic aspects of land use planning in hazard-prone areas, and with analysis of disaster relief efforts, evacuation strategies and why communities choose to rebuild or rezone disaster-stricken areas.

Such a program, they reckon, would eventually cost about \$80 million a year (about twice as much as the federal government now spends on disaster-related research), but they claim that "a redirection of national disaster research efforts and funding will yield benefits in several directions without adding

materially to the total cost of the research."

A key recommendation is that the federal government should establish semi-permanent interdisciplinary teams to make intensive studies of natural disasters, covering such factors as "the reaction to warnings under a variety of circumstances, what factors enable one community to organize for recovery more effectively than another, the similarities and differences in making comparable decisions about relocation of families, rebuilding, repair of public facilities and similar actions."

As for research on specific hazards, White and Haas suggest that current efforts should be redirected. Research on earthquake prediction and control, for example, "may yield low or negative benefits unless accompanied by studies of how they would be applied and how warnings could effectively be disseminated," and studies of building codes in earthquake-prone areas need to be accelerated. Important research into hurricane modification and control has also not been accompanied by sufficient study of evacuation schemes, land-use planning or methods to promote use of hurricane-proofing measures.

To add a bit of emphasis to their message, White and Haas open their massive report with a fictionalized description of what would happen if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco, a hurricane comes ashore in Miami, and a flood inundates Boulder, Colorado. They show how past land-use planning (or rather lack of it) has vastly increased the risks of damage, how evacuation and disaster-relief efforts would become hopelessly swamped, and how devastating such disasters would be in terms of loss of property and lives.

White and Haas note that those scenarios "may not be realized in this century, or they may be validated in tragic detail next year," and suggest that "one sobering lesson from past experience is that the nation has difficulty visualizing human suffering and economic disruption which will result from events whose coming is certain but whose timing is uncertain."

House Committee Plans Series of Hearings on R&D

The House Committee on Science and Technology has announced plans for various oversight hearings in the next few months. The following are the chief science policy activities:

NSF. Following a number of attacks on the quality of NSF's research programs, the subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology will hold hearings on NSF's peer review system on July 22-24 and July 29-31. That will be followed by an investigation of the geographical distribution of NSF grants, which will be carried out by the Committee staff and which may result in some public hearings. The Committee staff will also investigate the relative proportions of basic and applied research supported by NSF because "concern has arisen within the committee during recent years about the

rising proportion of applied research budget amounts vis-a-vis basic research." A staff review of NSF's social sciences programs will be conducted in the fall, to determine whether those programs are receiving adequate attention. Finally, a set of hearings on the program of Research Applied to National Needs will be rescheduled for early 1976.

Nonmilitary R&D. Activities planned for the new subcommittee on Domestic and International Scientific Planning and Analysis include an investigation of Agricultural R&D, criminal justice R&D, technology transfer and international trade, Soviet-American scientific cooperation, and science in China.

Environment. The new subcommittee on Environment and the Atmosphere is planning a series of hearings in the next few weeks on sulfate emissions, particularly the problem of sulphuric acid mist generated by the automobile exhaust catalyst, and on the organization and management of the programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The subcommittee will also take a look at EPA's research programs during hearings scheduled for October.

In Quotes

Mr. Donald Williams, Secretary
Cosmos Club
2121 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20008

Dear Mr. Williams:

Please accept my resignation from the Cosmos Club.

I resign with real regret, since I was proud of my election to the Club, and enjoyed it. However, the vote of March 3, barring membership to women, and the management's treatment of that issue, have left me no alternative. As to the issue itself, I do not endorse "affirmative action" and believe that women should stand strictly on their merits. But, by the same principle, it seems to me improper to bar qualified women from election to an intellectual club. Of course, a social club can admit only men, if the membership so wishes. But the Cosmos Club is not strictly a social club; members are admitted in large part on the basis of their scholarship or other special merit, and the Club prides itself on the scholarly distinction of its members; witness the framed photographs on the first floor of Nobel and Pulitzer prize winners.

The rule that no-one may vote who is not present at the meetings effectively disenfranchises out-of-town members. The management not only failed to poll its membership on the important issue of women's membership but suppressed letters on the subject, such as mine; in answer to my inquiry about my letter, the Club replied that "The Board plan for conduct of the meeting was unable to provide for the expression to the meeting of non-resident views received by correspondence." In other words, the management is unwilling to grant any voice to its out-of-town members, who may pay dues but who cannot effectively influence Club policy. This high-handed procedure negates any attempt by out-of-town members to work for reform from within the Club.

Sincerely yours,

F. H. Westheimer
Professor of Chemistry
Harvard University

European Environmental Groups

The environmental movement in Western Europe receives little attention in the US, but according to a survey sponsored by the European Commission, at least 20,000 "reasonably permanent" non-government organizations concerned with environmental affairs now exist in the nine Common Market countries. The figure does not include "groups which sprout up every day of the week to oppose a specific road construction project or an office block . . ."

Names of the major organizations, and details of some of their activities, are contained in a publication, *Non-Government Organizations for Protection of the Environment in the European Community*. Copies may be obtained without charge from the Commission of the European Communities, Press Office, 2100 M St. NW, Washington, DC 20037.

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Renew my subscription | <input type="checkbox"/> Check enclosed |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Enter my subscription | <input type="checkbox"/> Please bill |

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$65 ☐; two years, \$120 ☐

Individual subscribers: one year, \$44 ☐; two years, \$75 ☐

(Overseas airmail, \$17.50 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____

NSF to Open Parts of Peer Review Process

Under Congressional attack for alleged inequities in the operation of the peer review system (SGR Vol. V, No. 11), the National Science Foundation, starting next January, is going to raise the curtain a good way and publicly display some of the workings of that controversial method of giving away money.

In accordance with a resolution adopted June 20 by the National Science Board, the policymaking body for the Foundation, NSF will continue to protect the identities of reviewers of specific grant applications. But, in a departure from present policy, it will provide applicants with copies of the reviewers' comments, upon request, and rejected applicants, also upon request, will be told why they were turned down.

In addition, the Foundation will annually publish a list of all reviewers used by its various divisions. At present, those divisions that use formally constituted panels of reviewers put out such lists, but some divisions employ fairly informal review processes, and the identities of their reviewers are sometimes not available.

One byproduct of the change will be precise information on just how many reviewers the Foundation uses. Estimates run to about 35,000, but the exact figure isn't known, since some reviews amount to no more than a telephone call or a brief note.

In establishing the new policy, the Board made it clear that reviews that were produced under the old ground rules will remain confidential. Also, that reviewers' comments will not be available to third parties, which presumably includes those Members of Congress who have been claiming a right to access.

The Board's decision extends only to the National Science Foundation, but it is not unlikely that other agencies will take note and adjust their policies in the same direction.

Science Aid Mission in Hanoi

A long-delayed scientific aid mission to Vietnam, sponsored by the Scientists' Institute for Public Information (SIPI), has finally got under way. Arthur Galston, a Yale botanist and longtime opponent of the Vietnam war, is now in Hanoi advising the North Vietnamese on the establishment of a basic research program in agricultural botany.

Galston and Arthur Westing, a botanist from Windham College, Vermont, were set to travel to Hanoi last year when the Vietnamese abruptly cancelled the visit without explanation and threw the effort into some confusion (SGR Vol IV, No. 13). The chief purpose of that visit was to have been to help establish a research institute on agricultural botany in North Vietnam. The Vietnamese have now established the institute and Galston is helping to plan its research program.

In addition, a SIPI announcement states that Galston's visit is the beginning of what is hoped to be a more extensive scientific aid program by SIPI. The effort will include visits by other American scientists, and donations of equipment to the Vietnamese. The entire effort will cost about \$250,000, SIPI estimates; the sum will be provided by private donations.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D. C.

-00006 99/99
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106

SGR is now on its summer schedule. The next issue will be dated August 1, after which the regular twice-monthly publication schedule will recommence on Sept. 1.

